



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cent case to the contrary seems insupportable in that it confuses a witness's privilege with a party's rights. *People v. Gillette*, 39 N. Y. L. J. 1293 (N. Y., App. Div., June, 1908).

INJUNCTIONS — ACTS RESTRAINED — BALANCE OF CONVENIENCE DOCTRINE. — The defendant company constructed a system of sewage which extended on the plaintiff's land. The plaintiff prayed for an injunction to abate the nuisance caused by the discharge of sewage. *Held*, that the plaintiff is not entitled to an injunction. *Somerset Water, Light & Traction Co. v. Hyde*, 111 S. W. 1005 (Ky.).

The case follows numerous decisions which consider public convenience in the question of granting an injunction. *Valparaiso v. Hagen*, 153 Ind. 337. That this "balance of convenience" doctrine should be applicable to cases where the injury complained of is trivial seems reasonable. *Elliott v. Ferguson*, 103 S. W. 453 (Tex.). But its application in cases where the injury is substantial and the legal remedy admittedly inadequate seems as indefensible in principle as it is harsh in its results. The doctrine seems to rest upon two misconceptions of the extent of equitable power: the one, that the final settlement of property rights lies in a broad discretion of the chancellor and not in the clear legal and equitable rules which bind the chancellor himself; the other, that a court of equity may in effect condemn the property of an individual in the interest of the public, a power which the Constitution has placed in the legislature alone. *Sammons v. City of Gloversville*, 70 N. Y. Supp. 284; *Simmons v. Mayor, etc., of Paterson*, 60 N. J. Eq. 385. Further, the doctrine seems unwise in determining the standard of one person's right by the convenience of a particular public, or even, in its extension, by the necessities of another's business. *Lloyd v. Catlin Coal Co.*, 210 Ill. 460.

INJUNCTIONS — INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACTS — TRADING STAMP BUSINESS. — The plaintiff sold non-transferable trading stamps, redeemable at its stores, to merchants, who gave them to customers as a premium upon cash purchases. The defendant, a rival concern, purchased from holders or exchanged for its own stamps large quantities of the plaintiff's stamps which they sold to brokers, redeemed in large lots, or resold to the plaintiff's subscribers at a low rate. The plaintiff prayed for an injunction restraining the defendant from such practice. *Held*, that the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction. *Sperry & Hutchinson Co. v. Louis Weber & Co.*, 161 Fed. 219 (Circ. Ct., N. D. Ill.). See NOTES, p. 50.

JUDGMENTS — ESSENTIALS TO VALIDITY — WAIVER BY TESTATOR OF PERSONAL SERVICE ON EXECUTOR. — A, of Michigan, agreed with B, of Massachusetts, to submit a matter in dispute to arbitration under rule of court, the award to be binding on their executors in case of death. A died before the final award, and after notice by publication on A's executors judgment was given for B. *Held*, that the judgment is not binding on A's executors in Michigan. *Brown v. Fletcher*, 210 U. S. 82.

The "full faith and credit" clause of the Constitution does not prevent the court of a state in which the judgment of a sister state is presented from impeaching it for want of jurisdiction. *Thompson v. Whitman*, 18 Wall. (U. S.) 457. The test of jurisdiction is to be made at the time of verdict, not at the time of the commencement of the suit. Thus, jurisdiction over a citizen of another state is lost by his death, and it cannot be revived against his foreign executor, for personal service dies with the person. *Jones v. Jones*, 15 Tex. 463. A contract to waive personal service on oneself is probably good. See 15 HARV. L. REV. 746. But a contract to waive personal service on one's foreign executor has no effect. For a contract waiving appearance can give no greater right than actual appearance, and if an executor voluntarily submits to the jurisdiction of a foreign court, a judgment by that court is not binding on the estate, since an executor's representative character is a qualified one and cannot be extended beyond the jurisdiction of the court which created it. *Judy v. Kelley*, 11 Ill. 211.